UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,169	11/16/2005	Reinhard Nubbemeyer	SCH-1947-02	3554
	7590 08/13/200 TE, ZELANO & BRA	EXAMINER		
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.			CHUI, MEI PING	
SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON,	VA 22201	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@mwzb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/522,169	NUBBEMEYER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MEI-PING CHUI	1616	
	10/522,169 Examiner	10/522,169 NUBBEMEYER ET Examiner Art Unit

	MEI-PING CHUI	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in between appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a filed	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying t	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph to owable if submitted in a separate, to will not be entered, or b)	for claims 5-12. timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>13-16</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation below.	,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616	

Continuation of Box 11:

The request for reconsideration filed on 07/30/2009 has been fully considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance:

(1) Applicants argue that neither the office action nor the prior art of record teach or suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would have selected the two cited components and use in the claimed invention, especially when nowhere in the prior art, namely Krattenmacher et al., disloses that a joint administration with an androgen is useful for male contraception (Remarks: page 6).

The arguments are not persuasive because the prior art in combination teach and suggest all the claimed subject matters and claimed limitations (see Office Action, dated on 04/30/2009).

As stated in the previous Office Action, the primary prior art, namely Bohlmann et al., teaches the use of an androgenic 11 β -halogen steroid for the utility of male menopause or male birth control therapy. Importantly, Bohlmann et al. also specifically discloses the claimed 11 β -halogen steroid: 11 β -fluoro-17 β -hydroxy-7 α -methyl-estr-4-en-3-one and suggest that it can be used in combination with a progestogen compound for controlling male fertility (see Office Action, dated on 04/30/2009, page 4 and 5).

The secondary prior art, namely Krattenmacher et al., teaches that compounds of 14,17-C2-bridged steroids of formula (I) are gestagens, which have good gestagen action and are suitable for use in contraceptive purposes (or referred as progestogenic action). Krattenmacher et al. even specifically teach the instant gestagen (21S)-21-hydroxy-21-methyl-14,17-ethano-19-norpregna-4,9,15-triene-3,20-dione as one of the preferred gestagen of formula (I) (see Office Action, dated on 04/30/2009, page 6 and structure of compound B).

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize the 11β -halogen steroid: 11β -fluoro- 17β -hydroxy- 7α -methyl-estr-4-en-3-one (which is known to have the utility in male birth control) and also incorporates the gestagen (21S)-21-hydroxy-21-methyl-14,17-ethano-19-norpregna-4,9,15-triene-3,20-dione (which is known to be suitable for use in contraceptive purpose) to arrive at the instant composition for controlling male fertility, as suggested by Bohlmann et al. and Krattenmacher et al.

- (2) With respect to the arguments of the prior art Krattenmacher et al. does not teach the claimed gestagen of formula (I) is useful for male contraception and the claimed male contraceptive combination produces synergistic effect (Remarks: page 6-7), it is noted that the features upon which Applicants rely are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claim(s). See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- (3) In summary, the scope of the instant claims are not altered and thus, it is the examiner's position that the prior rejections of record (mailed on 04/30/2009) remains valid and will be maintained for the reason of record.